

REMARKS

The claims have been amended to resolve issues raised by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In this regard, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the recitations of claim 4, and claim 4 has been canceled accordingly.

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

On page 2 of the Office Action, in paragraph 1, claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amended claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection in view of the following remarks.

1. Uneven

Applicants have deleted the term "uneven" from claim 1. In place of the term "uneven", Applicants have incorporated the recitations of Ra and Rz of claim 4 into claim 1. Accordingly, claim 4 has been canceled.

2. Haze value

(1) Claim 1

The haze value recited in claim 1 is the haze value of total of the transparent polymer substrate and the cured resin layer-1 as it is defined as "based on" at page 12, lines 25-27 of the present application.

With respect to the disclosure that the haze value of the whole laminate is measured in Example 1 of the present application (page 28, lines 6-8 of the present application), Applicants note that the whole laminate contains other layers such as a hard coat layer 1 (page 27, line 9), a cured resin layer-2 (page 27, line 29) and an ITO layer (page 27, line 30), other than the transparent polymer substrate and the cured resin layer-1. However, Applicants submit that the existence of the other layers does not affect the haze value substantially, since the other layers do not contain particles, and therefore they are substantially transparent.

(2) Claim 9

Claim 9 has been amended in the same way as claim 1 with respect to the haze value issue.

3. Between

(1) Claim 5

Applicants have rewritten claim 5 as a cured resin layer-2 is located between the cured resin layer-1 and the transparent conductive layer.

(2) Claim 6

Applicants have rewritten claim 6 in the same way as claim 5, although Applicants note that the Examiner has not raised an issue with regard to claim 6.

4. Main component

Applicants have deleted the recitation "as the main component" from claim 7 to resolve this issue.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been overcome, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 29, 2010

/Bruce E. Kramer/
Bruce E. Kramer
Registration No. 33,725